



County of Orange

MEMO

MS Word Export To Multiple PDF Files Software - Please purchase license.

DATE: March 22, 2000

TO: Frank McGill, Site Planning Section

FROM: PDS/Environmental & Project Planning Services Division (E&PPSD)

SUBJECT: PA000018 - Folino Residence-Lot 51 of Tract 9507/Coto de Caza

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The applicant is requesting approval of a Site Development Permit for grading in excess of 500 cubic yards for a single family dwelling unit with attached garage and a barn with 2nd story living quarters. Also included in this project is a Use Permit for the 2nd unit over the barn.

PROJECT LOCATION: The proposed project site is located on lot 51 of Tract 9507, on Pradera Road which is off of Trigo Trail off of Coto de Caza Drive in Coto de Caza Specific Plan which is located in unincorporated Orange County.

CEQA DETERMINATION: The CEQA review of the subject project has been completed by the Environmental & Project Planning Services Division. Based upon its review, E&PPSD has determined that the proper CEQA documentation for the Project is FEIR 401. The following information is attached to this memo for your consideration:

- I. Instructions for Filing CEQA Documents with the County Clerk; and
- II. CEQA Statements, Actions and Findings which should be used for Staff Reports and AITs for the Project, including:
 - A. CEQA Compliance Statement(s) for AITs and Staff Reports; and
 - B. Recommended Action for Decision-maker(s) to Approve Project; and
 - C. Fish and Game Code Findings for Approval of Project; and
 - D. NCCP Finding for Approval of Project.
- III. IS PA000018

If clarification is needed regarding this Memo or if there are questions, please contact the following staff person from PDS/Environmental & Project Planning Services Division:

E&PPSD Staff Contact: Chris Uzo-Diribe Telephone Number: 834-2542
George Britton, Manager, Environmental & Project Planning Services Division

By: _____ Date: _____

Title: Chief, Environmental Section

Attachments1: Filing Instructions for County Clerk

Attachment 2: Recommended CEQA Statements, Actions, and Findings

Attachment 3: IS PA000018

Attachment 4: NOD

ATTACHMENT 1

FILING CEQA DOCUMENTS WITH THE COUNTY CLERK

Your division will be responsible for filing the CEQA documentation and paying its related \$38.00 filing fee with the County Clerk for your project. The County Clerk now only needs your CEQA document(s) with your project charge number in the upper right corner in order to post the document and recover this fee. You must, however, obtain a fee receipt from the County Clerk, which must then be turned in immediately to Management Services/Accounting Services. The County Clerk requires the \$38.00 documentary handling fee for the following items:

- * Negative Declarations (ND);
- * Notices of Determinations (NOD); and
- * Notices of Exemption (NOE)

Please note the following:

1. Within 5 days of Project approval by the Board, Planning Commission, Zoning Administrator, Subdivision Committee or Director of PDS, a Notice of Determination (NOD) must be filed with the County Clerk.
2. If E&PPSD has determined that the Project is exempt from the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) fees, a De Minimis Finding (Certificate of Fee Exemption) will be provided by E&PPSD and must accompany your project's NOD.
3. If E&PPSD has determined that the Project is exempt from the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) fees because the required fees were previously paid, a memo will be provided by E&PPSD and must accompany your project's NOD.
4. If E&PPSD cannot find your project exempt from the DFG fees and has no record of the fee payment, the Applicant will be required to pay \$888.00 for the EIR, including the \$38.00 handling fee.

You will need to fill in the information on the NOD form and get an original authorizing signature from your division after the approval action on your project. You will need to take the original set, and at least one set of copies to the EIR Clerk located in the Records/Clerks Office, Building 12, Civic Center Plaza. The Clerk will stamp the NOD and keep the original set. The Clerk will issue a receipt for the environmental document, which must be returned to Management Services/Accounting Services by the end of the day. A copy of a stamped NOD must be sent to E&PPSD for the file.

ATTACHMENT 2

RECOMMENDED CEQA STATEMENT ACTION AND FINDINGS FOR STAFF REPORTS/AITs

A. CEQA COMPLIANCE STATEMENT (FOR TEXT OF STAFF REPORT/AIT):

The CEQA compliance statement, located in the text of the staff report or body of the AIT under "Additional Data", shall include the following statement unless advised otherwise by County Counsel or the Manager, Environmental & Project Planning Services Division.

The proposed project is covered by Final EIR 401, previously certified on 09/21/82. Prior to project approval, the decision-maker must assert that this EIR is adequate to satisfy the requirements of CEQA for the proposed project.

B. RECOMMENDED ACTION STATEMENT FOR APPROVING PROJECT:

State law requires that action on a CEQA document be taken by the decision-maker prior to approval of the project for which it has been prepared. The following action must be taken before action on the project, unless directed otherwise by County Counsel or the Manager, Environmental & Project Planning Services Division.

The decision-maker has determined that Final EIR 401, previously certified on 09/21/82 satisfies the requirements of CEQA and is approved as a Program EIR for the proposed project based upon the following findings:

- a. Based on the Initial Study, it is found that the EIR serves as a Program EIR for the proposed project; and
- b. The approval of the previously certified Final EIR for the project reflects the independent judgment of the Lead Agency.

C. FISH AND GAME CODE FINDING FOR APPROVAL OF PROJECT:

Find that pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Code, this project is exempt from the required fees as it has been determined that no adverse impacts to wildlife resources will result from the project.

D. NCCP FINDING FOR APPROVAL OF PROJECT:

Find that the proposed project will not have a significant unmitigated impact upon Coastal Sage Scrub habitat and, therefore, will not preclude the ability to prepare an effective Subregional Natural Communities Conservation Planning (NCCP) Program.

ATTACHMENT 3
A USE PERMIT TO ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
FOR PA000018, THE FOLINO RESIDENCE
LOT 51 TRACT 9507

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The applicant is requesting approval of a Site Development Permit for grading in excess of 500 cubic yards for a single family dwelling unit with attached garage and a barn with 2nd story living quarters. Also included in this project is a Use Permit for the 2nd unit over the barn.

PROJECT LOCATION: The proposed project site is located on lot 51 of Tract 9507, on Pradera Road which is off of Trigo Trail off of Coto de Caza Drive in Coto de Caza Specific Plan of unincorporated Orange County.

EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

The site is a 2.0 acres and area of disturbance will be 2.0 acre. The subject site topography is gentle slope, with flora and fauna typical to Coto de Caza area; mostly native grasses. The ground water is assumed to be moderately deep. The slope faces southerly is mostly 10%. No coastal sage scrub, no oak trees or any other tree are located on the site. The lot is located within a residential neighborhood with some of the surrounding lots, under construction or built.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

Under Section 15002(d) of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, a project is defined as an activity subject to CEQA. Further, the term project refers to an activity, which is being proposed and has a potential for resulting in a physical change in the environment directly or ultimately.

A private project (Sec. 15377) means a project, which will be carried out by a person other than a governmental agency, but the project will need a discretionary approval from one or more governmental agency.

Proposed site plan/use permit PA 000018, is regarded as a private project subject to Zoning Administrator's approval and is part of a previously approved Environmental Impact Report (EIR) 401 which was certified on September 21, 1982 along with Addendum No. 2 certified on June 13, 1989, and Addendum 3 approved April 19, 1995.

In accordance with Sec. 15063 an Initial Study was completed on the subject project by the Environmental & Project Planning Division (E&PPD) and it was determined that this document provides appropriate documentation for the subject project.

The following is the analysis of the subject proposal and the compilation of pertinent mitigation measures/conditions derived from EIR 401 and Addendum Number 2 approved and adopted for the Zone Change and Area Plan for the Coto de Caza Specific Plan Community, and the County's Standard Conditions of Approval. These mitigation measures/conditions have been updated to reflect the latest requirements of CEQA in addition to County ordinances, policies and guidelines.

1. LAND USE & PLANNING

- a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?*
- b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies of agencies with jurisdiction over the project?*
- c) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (e.g. low income, minority)?*
- d) Conflict with adjacent, existing or planned land uses?*

ANALYSIS:

The proposed project is consistent with the LUE 1B, Rural Residential designation, for the subject site. The project also complies with Planning Area 1 (Rural Residential regulations) of the Coto de Caza Specific Plan. It is also, in compliance with the Coto de Caza site development and Use Permit standards. The Area Plan Implementation Program Report as approved ensures that there is no land use inconsistencies. Therefore, no significant impact is anticipated.

No mitigation measure is required.

2. AGRICULTURE. Would project:

- a) Convert Farmlands listed as "Prime", "Unique" or of "Statewide Importance" as shown on the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, to non-agricultural use?*
- b) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?*

ANALYSIS:

There is no farmland conversion involved with the proposed project, due to its nature either as a prime, unique or Statewide importance. The scope of the project is such that its location or nature would not involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use.

No mitigation measure is necessary.

3. POPULATION & HOUSING

- a) Cumulatively exceed adopted regional or local population projections?*
- b) Induce substantial growth in an area directly or indirectly through project in an undeveloped areas or extension of major infrastructure?*
- c) Displace existing housing affecting a substantial number of people?*

ANALYSIS:

The proposed project will not cumulatively exceed adopted regional or local population projections or induce substantial growth in an area directly or indirectly, due to the fact that the proposed project is part of the existing projected population for this Specific Plan.

No mitigation measure is required.

4. GEOPHYSICAL. Would project result in or expose people to impacts involving:

- a) Local fault rupture?*
- b) Seismicity: ground shaking or liquefaction?*
- c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?*
- d) Landslides or mudslides?*
- e) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading or fill?*
- f) Subsidence of the land?*
- g) Expansive soils?*
- h) Unique geologic or physical features?*

ANALYSIS:

The proposed project is located in the Canada Gobernadora Master Plan Drainage (MPD). No MPD facilities are involved and no fees are required. However, the subject project may bring about erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading or fill. The grading activities associated with the proposed project consist of approximately 1,000 cubic yards of raw cut and 18,000 cubic yards of fill. Additional fill will be imported from other

project areas within the Specific Plan. The proposed project will be adopting measures like sandbagging to reduce siltation to the willow area below the project site.

The subject project is expected to be in compliance with all the County's Grading and Excavation Code standards. Also, the following mitigation measures included in FEIR 401 will ensure that any adverse significant impacts will be reduced to below a level of significance:

Mitigation Measure#1

Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall submit a geo-technical report to the Manager, Subdivision & Grading Services, for approval. The report shall include the information and be in a form as required by the Grading Manual.

Mitigation Measure#2

Prior to issuance of a grading permit, detailed grading plans further defining the extent of earthwork requirements for the project, shall be submitted by the applicant during subsequent, more detailed levels of project planning to the Manager, Subdivision & Grading Services, for approval.

5. HYDROLOGY & DRAINAGE. Would the proposal result in:

- a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in manner which would result in:*
 - i) Substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*
 - ii) A substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff in manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?*
- b) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*
- c) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?*
- d) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam, or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?*

ANALYSIS:

The subject site lies within the Canada Gobernadora Area Master Plan of Drainage. The proposed project may contribute to the increased potential for erosion and sediment transport to surrounding drainage courses, due to grading and debris from construction activity. It may also

have the potential for increase in peak run-off resulting in increased erosion potential, increased urban pollution and an increase in downstream peak flows.

Therefore, the following mitigation measure which is included in FEIR 401 will be required to eliminate impacts to a level of less than significance:

Mitigation Measure#3

Prior to issuance of any grading permits, the following drainage study shall be submitted to and approved by the Manager, Subdivision & Grading Division:

Detailed drainage studies indicating how the site grading in conjunction with the drainage conveyance systems, including applicable swales, channels, street flows, catch basins, storm drains and flood water retarding, will allow building pads to be safe from inundation from rainfall run-off which may be expected from all storms up to and including the theoretical 100-year flood.

Mitigation Measure #4

Prior to issuance of any grading permit, and if determined necessary by the Manager, Subdivision and Grading, a letter of consent, in a form approved by the Manager, Subdivision & Grading, as suitable for recording, shall be obtained from upstream and/or downstream property owners permitting drainage diversions and/or unnatural concentrations.

6. WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*
- b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of a local groundwater table level?*
- c) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*

ANALYSIS:

The subject project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, neither is it expected to substantially deplete or degrade water quality due to its nature. Therefore, no significant adverse impact is anticipated.

No mitigation measure is required.

7. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:

- a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion beyond adopted policies and/or forecasts?*
- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*
- c) Safety hazards from design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?*
- d) Inadequate emergency access of access to nearby uses?*
- e) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?*
- f) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?*
- g) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*
- h) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?*
- i) Change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?*

ANALYSIS:

The subject site lies within the area of benefit for the Foothill Circulation Phasing Program and Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor and is required to pay fees in accordance with the adopted programs.

Though the proposed project is not expected to generate any significant amount of traffic that is beyond regional analysis, there will be temporary increases in traffic during grading and construction activities due to importation of dirt and hauling of construction equipment. This impact will be mitigated through compliance with Mitigation Measure #5 which is a standard requirement pursuant to the Orange County Grading & Excavation Code. Therefore, no long-term adverse significant impact is anticipated from the proposed project.

Approximately 1,275-truck loads of dirt will be imported, on site. A total of 17,000 cubic yard of dirt will be imported from other construction sites within or outside of Coto de Caza Specific Plan. To ensure this temporary impact is minimized, the applicant is required to comply with the following mitigation measure:

Mitigation Measure#5

Prior to issuance of any grading permit, an approval of a haul route shall be required, meeting the approval of the Manager, Subdivision & Grading Services Division.

8. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

- a) Violate any SCAQMD standard or contribute to air quality deterioration beyond projections of SCAQMD?*
- b) Expose sensitive population groups to pollutants in excess of acceptable levels?*
- c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?*
- d) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?*

ANALYSIS:

Under Air Quality impacts were identified regarding the pollutants emitted by construction activities, and the incremental increase in emission created by higher human activity and supposedly increased auto emissions in the area. EIR 401 already requires that water techniques be employed to partially mitigate the short-term impact of construction-generated dust particulate, which the proposed project has already incorporated water spraying in the plan. Especially since the project would require grading of approximately 17,000 cubic yards of dirt on the site.

Southern Orange County's vehicular emissions may be reduced through legislative exhaust emission controls as well as provision of mass transit in the area, according to the FEIR 401.

The relative balance of proposed grading and construction for the residential unit and employment opportunities in the Coto de Caza area will work to implement Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) regional planning policies in minimizing future project emissions. The subject project is not expected to violate any SCAQMD standard or contribute to air quality deterioration, due to its scope. However, short-term dust emissions may occur, during grading and construction. But, compliance with the County's Grading and Excavation Code will ensure that any significant impact will be reduced below a level of significance.

No mitigation measure is necessary.

9. NOISE. Would the proposal:

- a) Increase existing noise levels?*
- b) Expose people to noise levels exceeding adopted County standards?*
- c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

ANALYSIS:

The proposed project site is not within any noise sensitive zone or close to any arterial highway. No long-term impact is anticipated from the subject project, however, temporary impact emanating from grading and construction equipment is anticipated; however compliance with the following mitigation measure which was included in FEIR 401 will reduce the impacts below a level of significance:

Mitigation Measure#6

- A. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, the project proponent shall produce evidence acceptable to the Manager, Subdivision & Grading, that:
 - (1) All construction vehicles or equipment, fixed or mobile, operated within 1,000' of a dwelling shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers.
 - (2) All operations shall comply with Orange County Codified Ordinance Division 6 (Noise Control).
 - (3) Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be located as far as practicable from dwellings.
- B. Notations in the above format, appropriately numbered and included with other notations on the front sheet of grading plans, will be considered as adequate evidence of compliance with this condition.

10. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project impact:

- a) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats including, but not limited to, plants, fish, insects, animals and birds?*
- b) Locally designated species e.g. heritage trees?*
- c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g. oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?*
- d) Wetland habitat e.g. marsh, riparian and vernal pool?*
- e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?*
- f) Adopted conservation plans and policies (e.g. Natural Community Conservation Plan or Resource Management Plan)?*

ANALYSIS:

There is no Coastal Sage, or oaks or other heritage trees on site. The subject site features no discernable species of plant or animal on site. Therefore, no significant impact on biological resources is anticipated from the proposed project.

No mitigation is necessary.

11. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

- a) Affect a scenic vista or view open to the public?*
- b) Affect a designated scenic highway?*
- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*
- d) Create light or glare beyond the physical limits of the project site?*

ANALYSIS:

The most significant aesthetic features (ridgelines, oak habitats etc.), will be preserved through the implementation of the Coto de Caza Open Space Plan. The Open Space Plan preserves important natural resources and major ridgelines through the designation of scenic and conservation easements. The proposed project, is not expected to have a significant impact to aesthetic resources, neither will it result in the creation of any aesthetically offensive site to the adjacent properties. The proposed site, is not within the scenic easement or Open Space area and therefore, will not result in the obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public.

However, to ensure that visual impacts are minimized, in terms of preserving image and outlook of the area, the proposed project is expected to comply with the following mitigation measures included in FEIR 401 and with the Orange County Zoning Code Sec. 7-9-144.8 that requires all light be designed and installed so that direct light rays be confined to the premises of the subject site.

Mitigation Measure#7

Prior to the issuance of building permits, landscaping for privately maintained areas should be designed in accordance with a plan. The plan shall be certified by a licensed landscape architect or a licensed landscape contractor, as required, as taking into account approved preliminary landscape plan (if any), PDS Standard Plans, adopted planned community regulations, scenic corridor and specific plan requirements, Grading and Excavation Code erosion control requirements, Subdivision Code, Zoning Code, and conditions of approval, Water Conservation Measures contained in Board Resolution 90-487 (Water Conservation Measures) and Board Resolution 90-1341 (Water Conservation Implementation Plan). Said plan shall be reviewed by the Manager, Harbors, Beaches and Parks/Program Planning and be reviewed and approved by the Manager, Subdivision & Grading Services Division.

Mitigation Measure#8

Prior to the issuance of certificates of use and occupancy, applicant shall install said landscaping and irrigation system and shall have a licensed landscape architect or licensed landscape contractor, as applicable, certifies that it was installed in accordance with the certified plan. Said certification, including an irrigation management report for each landscape irrigation system, and any other implementation report determined applicable, shall be furnished in writing to the Manager, Building Inspection Services Division.

12. CULTURAL/SCIENTIFIC RESOURCES. Would the project:

- a) Disturb archaeo or paleo resources?*
- b) Affect historical resources?*
- c) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?*

ANALYSIS:

Under the IMPACTS section of CULTURAL RESOURCES of EIR 401 and Addendum No. 2, impacts were identified regarding historical and paleontological resources in the area. Specifically, impacts would be created by grading and subsequent development of this native terrain. EIR 401 specifies that grading operations could expose potentially significant paleontological resources. All standard cultural/scientific resource management procedures outlined in County Policy and Procedures BR-77-866 must be implemented as necessary for this project to ensure that impacts to cultural/paleontological resources remained below a level of significance.

No additional mitigation measure is required.

13. RECREATION. Would proposal:

- a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration or the facility would occur or be accelerated?*
- b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*
- c) Conflict with adopted recreational plans or policies?*

ANALYSIS:

The Parks and Recreation Facilities Implementation Plan for Coto de Caza ensures adequate distribution of recreational opportunities for the entire Coto de Caza community. The proposed project would not result in any impact to either the quality or quantity of any recreational facility. The Local Park Code requirement for Tentative Tract 9507 had already been satisfied prior to this action.

No mitigation measure is warranted.

14. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?*
- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?*

ANALYSIS:

The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource or locally-important mineral resource recovery site, due to its nature.

No mitigation measure is warranted.

15. HAZARDS. Would the project:

- a) Create a hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*
- b) Create a hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*
- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*
- d) Exposure of people to existing sources of health hazards?*
- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*
- f) For a project within the vicinity of private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*
- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?*

ANALYSIS:

The proposed project involves grading and construction of a new single family dwelling. All public health and safety concerns associated with the proposed project will be mitigated through compliance with the county's building and fire codes.

No mitigation measure is necessary.

16. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would project result in needs for new or substantial alterations:

- a) Power or natural gas?*
- b) Communications systems?*
- c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?*
- d) Sewer or septic tanks?*
- e) Solid waste disposal?*

ANALYSIS:

During the planning process of the Coto de Caza Specific Plan, public service impacts were considered regarding solid waste disposal, communication system, gas system, sewer or septic tanks e.t.c. The project's need is incorporated into the previous planning process, therefore, the proposed single residential home is not expected to have any significant impacts that have not been addressed.

No mitigation measure is warranted.

17. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would project result in needs for new/alterd government facilities/services in:

- a) Fire protection?*
- b) Police protection?*

c) Schools?

d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?

e) Other government services?

ANALYSIS:

During the planning process of the Coto de Caza Specific Plan Community utilities and service system impacts were considered and incorporated into the planning process regarding schools, police protection, electric service, fire and other government services. The subject project would not create any additional significant impact.

No mitigation measure is required.

FINDINGS

- A. The project would not have any impacts on fish but may impact wildlife habitat or communities, rare or endangered species or any periods of California history.
- B. Due to the project's small scale and the mitigation measures described above, no long-term environmental goals would be compromised.
- C. Due to the mitigation measures described above there are no known effects from other projects that would result in significant cumulative impacts.
- D. The project would not have any adverse effects on human beings. The mitigation measures described above would reduce the adverse effects below the level of significance.
- E. FEIR 401 which was certified on September 21, 1982 along with Addendum No. 2 certified on June 13, 1989, and Addendum 3 approved April 19, 1995 satisfy the requirements of CEQA for the subject project PA 000018.

CUD:cud8040208544842

Prepared by:

_____ **Date:** _____

Chris Uzo-Diribe

Environmental & Project Planning Services Division